



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,086	06/21/2000	Eric S. Rockey	MSI-562US	6625

22801 7590 10/28/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/599,086

Applicant(s)

ROCKEY ET AL.

Examiner

Dennis G Bonshock

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06-21-00.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-34, 60-67, and 68 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 35-59 and 69-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-13, 35-59 and 69-79, drawn to a method of establishing context and automatically displaying related commands, classified in class 345, subclass 708.
 - II. Claims 14-34, drawn to explaining the makeup of document areas, classified in class 345, subclass 781.
 - III. Claims 60-67, drawn to a method of evaluating expressions, classified in class 345, subclass 705.
 - IV. Claim 68, drawn to a tree structure for evaluation expressions, classified in class 345, subclass 853.
2. Inventions of group I and of group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, the invention of group I, a method of establishing context and automatically displaying related commands, has a separate utility than that in group II, being explaining the makeup of document areas. Accordingly, the method of group I may be generated in an entirely different manner from that claimed in group II. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
3. Inventions of group I and of group III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, the invention of

Art Unit: 2173

group I, a method of establishing context and automatically displaying related commands, has a separate utility than that in group III, being a method of evaluating expressions. Accordingly, the method of group I may be generated in an entirely different manner from that claimed in group III. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

4. Inventions of group I and of group IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, the invention of group I, a method of establishing context and automatically displaying related commands, has a separate utility than that in group IV, being a tree structure for evaluation expressions. Accordingly, the method of group I may be generated in an entirely different manner from that claimed in group IV. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups II, III, and IV is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. During a telephone conversation with Lance R. Sadler, on September 12, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-13, 35-59 and 69-79. Affirmation of this election must be made by the applicant in replying to this office action. Claims 14-34, 60-67, and 68 are withdrawn

Art Unit: 2173

from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show S515 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In the RELATED APPLICATIONS section, there are no serial numbers listed to the corresponding references.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

10. Claim 59 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Reference to the parent claim must precede the new claimed material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 35-40, 43, 46-48, 50-54, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bibayan, Patent # 5,572,648.

13. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a method of exposing commands based on the users context, Bibayan teaches, in column 1, lines 17-22, a display of a toolbar containing dynamic data that changes in accordance with the context of the environment of the currently operating application program.

14. With regard to claim 2, which teaches automatically removing commands from the display responsive to a change in user context, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 45, that if tools are deemed not relevant then the display is modified to not include them.

15. With regard to claim 5, which teaches executing a command without requiring any action from a user other than selecting the command, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 53, an active toolbar where commands can be selected (executed) at any time.

16. With regard to claim 6, which teaches, determining comprises ascertaining a position of a user's cursor with in a document provided by the application program, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, lines 40-44, the user locating and initiating a command.

Art Unit: 2173

17. With regard to claim 7, which teaches determining comprising ascertaining a user's selection within a document provided by the application program, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, lines 40-44, the user locating and initiating a command.

18. With regard to claim 8, which teaches determining comprises ascertaining the position of a user's cursor within a document provided by the application program and ascertaining a user's selection within a document provided by the application program Bibayan teaches, in column 4, lines 40-44, the user locating and initiating a command.

19. With regard to claim 9, which teaches the context pertaining to various tasks that the user may attempt to accomplish, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, the context modified with tool functions, which apply to the currently running folder.

20. With regard to claim 10, which teaches that the context pertains to one or more of: a type of document, a state of a document, a cursor's location, and a particular users selection, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, the context modified with tool functions which apply to the currently running folder.

21. With regard to claim 11, which teaches displaying being independent of a user selecting any displayed menu item, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, that modification is based on context changes.

22. With regard to claim 35, which teaches a method of exposing commands in a software application comprising; determining a user's context, Bibayan teaches, in column 1, lines 17-22, a display of a toolbar containing dynamic data that changes in accordance with the context of the environment or the currently operating application program. With regard to claim 35, further teaching automatically displaying at least one

Art Unit: 2173

context block based on user context, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, modifying the toolbar when the context is modified. The context contains tool functions, which apply to the currently running folder.

23. With regard to claim 36, which teaches determining comprising evaluating a portion of one or more expressions, expressions being associated with a context block, and defining a condition that describes one or more aspect of a user's interaction, Bibayan teaches, in column 2, lines 41-51, defining a context environment which creates data for a designated container, The method contains steps of executing to determine environment, and modify with respect to the context.

24. With regard to claim 37, which teaches the expression evaluating to a Boolean value, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 5, determining if the context modifies the toolbar or if it doesn't (much like a Boolean to modify? True or False).

25. With regard to claim 38, which teaches, that the context pertains to one or more of: a type of document, a state of a document, and a particular users selection, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, the context modified with tool functions which apply to the currently running folder.

26. With regard to claim 39, which teaches displaying comprising displaying a context block having a title bar area that labels the context block, Bibayan teaches, in figure 4, a context block that has a given title associated with it.

27. With regard to claim 40, which teaches the tile bar area configured to enable the context block to be toggled between expanded and collapsible states, Bibayan teaches,

in figure 4 both the static and dynamic tool palettes being standard windows which have the functionality to be maximized, minimized, and closed.

28. With regard to claim 43, which teaches displaying a context block with a controls area that exposes the multiple commands to the user, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, determining whether to modify a tool display and displaying tool functions based on the context.

29. With regard to claim 46, which teaches a method of exposing commands in a software application program, comprising determining a users context and displaying a dynamic toolbar based on the context, Bibayan teaches, in column 1, lines 17-22, a display of a toolbar containing dynamic data that changes in accordance with the context of the environment or the currently operating application program. With regard to claim 46, further teaching that while the commands are displayed, allowing the user to select and apply various commands multiple times, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 53, the dynamic tool palette being always active, where the operator can select any one of the commands.

30. With regard to claim 47, which teaches applying one or more of select commands, when selected by the user without further interaction, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 53, the dynamic tool palette being always active, where the operator can select any one of the commands.

31. With regard to claim 48, which teaches displaying comprising displaying the commands responsive to the user selecting from a menu bar supported by automatically-appearing and disappearing context block that contains context-sensitive

commands, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, lines 2-7 and lines 52-57, modifying the toolbar in response to a change in context, and a possible deletion of the toolbar.

32. With regard to claim 50, which teaches displaying comprises displaying the commands within a context pane having a title bar that labels the context pane and a controls area that exposes the commands to the user, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 2, and in figure 4, a dynamic toolbar which has separate title and tool sections.

33. With regard to claim 51, which teaches the context pane being non-collapsible, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 21, the user opening a context pane and a static pane by opening a specific application, therefor they are always displayed, the reference goes on the not specifically mention collapsing the context pane.

34. With regard to claim 52, which teaches that the context pane must be closed by the user, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, lines 52-57, that when all applets have been terminated the dynamic tool palette display can be terminated, as well.

35. With regard to claim 53, which teaches that the user requests the context pane be displayed, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 21, the user opens a context pane by opening a specific application.

36. With regard to claim 54, which teaches that some of the commands being context-sensitive and are disabled if they are out of context, Bibayan teaches, in column 5, line 45, that if tools are deemed not relevant then the display is modified to not include them.

Art Unit: 2173

40. With regard to claim 59, which teaches one or more computer readable instructions, which are executed by a computer, Bibayan teaches, in column 4, line 9, that the medium is a personal computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

37. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

38. Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 41, 42, 45, 49, 56, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bibayan and Meyer et al., Patent # 5,742,504, hereinafter Meyer.

39. With regard to claims 3 and 4, Bibayan teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar for an application program (see column 1, line 17), but doesn't teach it being a document-centric program, that displaying does not obscure the document in which the user is working, and that the command is displayed in a modeless fashion in which the user can continue to work in the document while the command is displayed. Meyer teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches a document-centric format, and that displaying does not obscure a document (see figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Meyer before him at the time the invention was

made to modify the dynamic toolbar system of Bibayan to include the document-centric format and the display of this toolbar to be non-obtrusive, as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because having the ability to work with in a document while displaying all the toolbar options allows the user to use the toolbar options without obscuring the document.

40. With regard to claim 12, Bibayan teaches a system for determining a users context, displaying a dynamic toolbar for an application program (see column 1, line 17), and for automatically removing said command responsive to a change in context (see column 5, line 45), but doesn't teach that the command is displayed in a modeless fashion in which the user can continue to work in the document while the command is displayed. Meyer teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches the toolbar being displayed in a non-intrusive manner (see figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the dynamic toolbar system of Bibayan to include the display of this toolbar to be non-intrusive, as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because having the ability to work within a document while displaying all the toolbar options allows the user to use the toolbar options without obscuring the document.

41. With regard to claim 13, which teaches determining comprises ascertaining a position of a user's cursor with in a document provided by the application program and ascertaining a user's selection within a document provided by the application program

Art Unit: 2173

Bibayan further teaches, in column 4, lines 40-44, the user locating and initiating a command.

42. With regard to claim 41, Bibayan teaches a system for determining a users context, displaying a dynamic toolbar for an application program (see column 1, line 17), but doesn't teach a title bar area containing a display button configured to enable a menu associated with the context block. Meyer teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches the toolbar containing a menu that is associated with a context block. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify dynamic toolbar system of Bibayan to include the display of this menu bar, as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the use of a menu bar in a toolbar can add a sub-menu with added functionality.

43. With regard to claim 42, which teaches a menu button that contains links to one or more context panes, each comprising additional context sensitive information, Meyer further teaches, in column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 16, menu buttons that open additional context-sensitive panes.

44. With regard to claim 45, Bibayan teaches a system for determining a users context, displaying a dynamic toolbar for an application program (see column 1, line 17), and for automatically removing said command responsive to a change in context (see column 5, line 45), but doesn't teach that the command is displayed in a modeless fashion in which the user can continue to work in the document while the command is

Art Unit: 2173

displayed. Meyer teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches the toolbar being displayed in a non-intrusive manner (see figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the dynamic toolbar system of Bibayan to include the display of this toolbar to be non-intrusive, as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because having the ability to work with in a document while displaying all the toolbar options allows the user to use the toolbar options without obscuring the document.

45. With regard to claim 49, Bibayan teaches, in column 1, lines 17-22, a display of a toolbar containing dynamically data in accordance with the context of the environment or the currently operating application program; however, he fails to teach displaying the commands in a modeless manner. Meyer teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches displaying commands in a modeless manner (see figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the Dynamic toolbar system of Bibayan to include the display of this toolbar to be non-obtrusive, as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because having the ability to work with in a document while displaying all the toolbar options allows the user to use the toolbar options without obscuring the document.

Art Unit: 2173

46. With regard to claims 56 and 57, Bibayan teaches, in column 1, lines 17-22, a display of a toolbar containing dynamically data in accordance with the context of the environment or the currently operating application program, however, he fails to teach a help feature accessible via and icon on the title bar and this help being displayed in a modeless fashion. Meyer teaches a system for displaying a dynamic toolbar similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches displaying a help command in a modeless fashion (see column 21, line 65 and figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the dynamic toolbar system of Bibayan to include the display of a help icon in the toolbar in a modeless fashion. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because having the ability to access a help command with out moving or minimizing screens has a time saving benefit.

47. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bibayan and Powers, III et al., Patent # 5,602,996, hereinafter Powers.

48. With regard to claim 58, Bibayan teaches, in column 1, lines 17-22, a display of a toolbar containing dynamic data in accordance with the context of the environment or the currently operating application program; however, he fails to teach multiple context panes stackable in a queue. Powers teaches a method of handling panes similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches, in column 3, lines 9-35, overlapping windows that can contain button functions, layering on top of one another in which only the top window of the stack is active. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Powers before him at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2173

modify the display of toolbars containing dynamic data of Bibayan to contain the hierarchical organization as did Powers. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because ordering of window is important to make sure that secondary functions of a previous context are implemented before moving into a different context.

49. Claims 69-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baer et al., Patent # 6,611,840, hereinafter Baer and Meyer.

50. With regard to claim 69, Baer teaches a computer system comprising a single application program comprising a single navigable window, further teaching multiple different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated by a user (see figures 8-21, column 2, lines 14-21, column 45, lines 45-50, and column 49, lines 13-22), but doesn't teach a context sensitive command area for navigating the windows or a single application program configured to automatically change command sets that are presented to the user. Meyer teaches a dynamic windowing environment similar to that of Baer but further teaches, in column 21, line 65 through column 22, line 11, a context sensitive toolbar with volatile elements that only appear in specific context. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baer and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the windowing environment of Baer to include the dynamic command areas as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because dynamic command areas provide useful functions that can be preformed on the live document, while omitting non-applicable tools.

Art Unit: 2173

51. With regard to claim 70, which teaches the single application program configured to provide navigation instrumentalities associated with the window, and these functionalities being configured for use, Baer further teaches in figures 8-21, navigating between different functionalities through the use of navigation buttons such as HOME, REGISTER LOGIN, LIBRARY, and HELP.

52. With regard to claim 71, which teaches that the navigation instrumentalities comprises links associated with each different functionalities, Baer further teaches in figures 8-21, navigating between different functionalities through the use of navigation buttons which contain links to different pages such as HOME, REGISTER LOGIN, LIBRARY, and HELP.

53. With regard to claim 72, which teaches one of the navigation instrumentalities comprising browser-like navigation buttons to navigate a window between different functionalities, Baer teaches, in figures 8-21 and in column 2, lines 14-21, a web based browser system, having embedded links to related pages.

54. With regard to claim 73, which teaches multiple different functionalities comprising document-centric functionalities, Baer teaches, in figures 8-21 and in column 2, lines 14-21, a web based browser system, which is document centered.

55. With regard to claim 74, Baer teaches a computer system comprising a single application program, further teaching multiple different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated by a user (see figures 8-21, column 2, lines 14-21, column 45, lines 45-50, and column 49, lines 13-22) and incorporating different functionalities in an extensible manner so that the user can use the single navigable

window to navigate to the different functionalities (see figures 8-21 column 45, lines 45-50, and column 49, lines 13-22), but doesn't teach a context sensitive command area for navigating the windows or a single application program configured to automatically change command sets that are presented to the user. Meyer teaches a dynamic windowing environment similar to that of Baer but further teaches, in column 21, line 65 through column 22, line 11, a context sensitive toolbar with volatile elements that only appear in specific context. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baer and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the windowing environment of Baer to include the dynamic command areas as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because dynamic command areas provide useful functions that can be preformed on the live document, while omitting none applicable tools.

56. With regard to claim 75, which teaches the single application program configured to provide navigation instrumentalities associated with the window, and these functionalities being configured for use, Baer further teaches in figures 8-21, navigating between different functionalities through the use of navigation buttons such as HOME, REGISTER LOGIN, LIBRARY, and HELP.

57. With regard to claim 76, which teaches that the navigation instrumentalities comprise links associated with each different functionalities, Baer further teaches in figures 8-21, navigating between different functionalities through the use of navigation buttons which contain links to different pages such as HOME, REGISTER LOGIN, LIBRARY, and HELP.

Art Unit: 2173

58. With regard to claim 77, which teaches one of the navigation instrumentalities comprising browser-like navigation buttons to navigate a window between different functionalities, Baer teaches, in figures 8-21 and in column 2, lines 14-21, a web based browser system, having embedded links to related pages.

59. With regard to claim 78, Baer teaches a computer method, further teaching multiple different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated by a user (see figures 8-21, column 2, lines 14-21, column 45, lines 45-50, and column 49, lines 13-22), receiving user input to indicate a selection of a particular functionality (see column 45, line 51), and incorporating different functionalities in an extensible manner so that the user can use the single navigable window to navigate to the different functionalities (see figures 8-21 column 45, lines 45-50, and column 49, lines 13-22), but doesn't teach a context sensitive command area for navigating the windows or a single application program configured to automatically change command sets that are presented to the user. Meyer teaches a dynamic windowing environment similar to that of Baer but further teaches, in column 21, line 65 through column 22, line 11, a context sensitive toolbar with volatile elements that only appear in specific context. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baer and Meyer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the windowing environment of Baer to include the dynamic command areas as did Meyer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because dynamic command areas provide useful functions that can be performed on the live document, while omitting none applicable tools.

Art Unit: 2173

60. With regard to claim 79, which teaches automatically removing said a least one command from the display responsive to change in the user's context, Mayer further teaches, in column 22, line 5, volatile buttons appearing only in specific contexts.

61. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bibayan and Baer. Bibayan teaches a method of displaying dynamic toolbars responsive to user context, but doesn't teach a command display being defined in HTML. Baer teaches a windowing environment similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches, the system being Internet based (HTML). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Baer before him at the time the invention was made to modify the dynamic toolbars of Bibayan to be used in an Internet environment. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because use of the dynamic toolbar in a browser will allow for easier navigation through the Internet.

62. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bibayan and Gayraud et al., Patent # 5,436,637, hereinafter Gayraud. Bibayan teaches a method of displaying dynamic toolbars responsive to user context, but doesn't teach context panes including context sensitive information. Gayraud teaches a windowing environment similar to that of Bibayan, but further teaches, a help feature for toolbars in which info is displayed when a users mouse moves over an icon (see column 3, lines 45-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bibayan and Gayraud before him at the time the invention was made to modify the method of displaying dynamic toolbars of Bibayan to include the help feature of Gayraud. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because

Art Unit: 2173

hints for tools can help a user to be able to make sense of a complex set of toolbar icons.

Conclusion


63. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach systems for creating a dynamic toolbar in a non-obstructing location on the screen.

64. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G Bonshock whose telephone number is (703) 305-4668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

65. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

66. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

dgb


JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER